

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 22, 2006 has been received and considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Allowability of Claims

The Applicant notes with appreciation the indication at page 4 of the Office Action that claims 1-12 and 14-19 recite allowable subject matter. The Applicant has opted to forgo rewriting claims 14-16 as suggested in view of the following remarks.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 13, 20 and 30

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 13, 20 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,992,987) in view of Beasley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,176). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 recites transmitting data to a first peripheral system over a first plurality of PCI Express port connectors and receiving data from the first peripheral system over a second plurality of PCI Express port connectors, wherein the second plurality is less than the first plurality. The cited references do not disclose these features. As indicated by the Office Action at page 2, Kobayashi fails to disclose a second plurality of PCI Express port connectors that is less than a first plurality. Further, Beasley does not remedy the deficiencies of Kobayashi. Beasley discloses a computerized switching system for coupling a workstation to a remotely located computer. *Beasley*, Abstract. Beasley nowhere discloses any PCI Express component, including any PCI Express port connectors. Accordingly, Beasley necessarily fails to disclose or suggest a second plurality of PCI Express port connectors less than a first plurality.

The Office Action indicates at page 2 that Figure 9 of Beasley allegedly discloses a second plurality of PCI Express port connectors less than a first plurality. However, Figure 9 of Beasley discloses a 16x16 analog switch. *Id.*, Figure 9, col. 9, lines 18-21. Thus, Figure 9 does not disclose PCI express port connectors, and therefore Beasley necessarily fails to disclose or suggest a second plurality of PCI Express port connectors less than a first plurality.

PATENT

Further, there is no motivation to combine Beasley and Kobayashi. "Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art." MPEP § 2143.01. Further, The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *Id.* (emphasis in original). The Office Action does not cite any portion of either reference that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Beasley, a reference that is concerned with a switching system for coupling a workstation to a remotely located computer, and Kobayashi, a reference that is concerned with a display interface between a PC motherboard and a display device. The two references purport to address different problems and are concerned with different levels of computer communication.

Further, according to Beasley

To connect a workstation to a remote computer, a user sends a command that causes the central crosspoint switch to couple the keyboard/mouse signals to one of the remote computers. As indicated above, commands that affect the operation of the crosspoint switch as inserted between "printscreen" and "enter" keystrokes. The pod connected to the workstation detects these keys and transmits a packet to the CPU on one of the output cards. The CPU then transmits the packet to the master CPU that validates the request and issues a command to the switch cards to set the position of the 16x16 digital and analog switches 182 and 184 (FIG. 6). Once the position of the switches has been set, the master CPU tells the computer pod 76 that the connection has occurred. The keyboard/mouse signals are then packetized and transmitted as pod to pod packets through the crosspoint switch. Video and audio signals from the remote computer are transmitted from the remote computer to the workstation.

Beasley, col. 10, lines 47-65. Kobayashi does not disclose that it can set the position of the 16x16 digital and analog switches used in *Beasley*. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine *Beasley* and Kobayashi.

With respect to claim 20, the claim recites a PCI Express port comprising a first plurality of data receive connectors to receive a first data when in a first mode of operation, and a second plurality of data transmit connectors dedicated to transmit a second data when in the first mode of operation, wherein the first plurality is greater than the second plurality. As indicated in the

PATENT

explanation above, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests these elements, and there is no motivation to combine the references.

With respect to claim 30, the claim recites receiving data to a first peripheral system over a first plurality of PCI Express port connectors and transmitting data from the first peripheral system over a second plurality of PCI Express port connectors, wherein the second plurality is less than the first plurality. As explained above, the cited references, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a second plurality of PCI Express port connectors less than a first plurality. Therefore, the cited references necessarily fail to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 30.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 21-29

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Beasley et al. as applied in claim 20 above, and further in view of common knowledge in the data processing art. This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed. Claims 21-29 depend from claim 20. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 21-29, at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 20. In addition, claims 21-29 recite additional novel elements. Applicant disagrees that the elements of claims 21-29 are well known in the art, and asks the Office to provide a reference disclosing or suggesting the elements of these claims.

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejections of claims 13 and 20-29 are improper. Withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration of the claims therefore is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

PATENT

The Applicant believes no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0441.

Respectfully submitted,



Adam D. Sheehan, Reg. No. 42,146

LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP

5914 W. Courtyard Dr., Suite 200

Austin, Texas 78730

(512) 439-7100 (phone)

(512) 439-7199 (fax)

10/17/06
Date